

MARSHALL MIDDLE SCHOOL – LYNN, MA	MEETING MINUTES
--	------------------------

School Building Committee (SBC) Meeting No. 17	May 6, 2014
Location:	100 Bennett Street, Room 206 - Staff Development Room
Time:	10:00 AM

Attendees:

Name	Assoc.	Present
Edward Calnan	SBC	Y
Richard Cowdell	SBC/Principal – TMMS	N
Michael Donovan	SBC/ISD/Building Commissioner	Y
John Ford	SBC/School Committee + Rep Steven Walsh	N
Richard Fortucci	SBC/Treasurer/CFO	Y
Thomas P. Iarrobino	SBC/School Committee Secretary	N
Catherine Latham	SBC/Superintendent	Y
Sue Rowe	SBC/Dir. Curriculum & Instruction	N
Jaye Warry	SBC/Deputy Superintendent	N
Charles E. White	SBC/Purchasing Agent	Y
<i>Darren Cyr</i>	<i>Councilor Ward 3</i>	<i>N</i>
<i>Patrick Santerre</i>	<i>TMMS Parent</i>	<i>N</i>
Brant Duncan	Lynn Teachers Union	N
Gene Raymond	Raymond Design Associates (RDA)	Y
Steven Lamothe	Raymond Design Associates (RDA)	Y
Jeffery Luxenberg	Joslin, Lesser + Associates (JLA)	Y
Lynn Stapleton	Joslin, Lesser + Associates (JLA)	Y
Mike Mallet	Walsh Brothers Inc. (WBI)	Y
Brian Bianchi	Walsh Brothers Inc. (WBI)	Y
Mazi Hashemi	Walsh Brothers Inc. (WBI)	N

Superintendent Latham called the meeting to order at 10:10 AM. There was a quorum of the School Building Committee voting members in attendance.

I. Design Update

Exterior Design Update

1. RDA presented the two options selected over the month of April for further development during Exterior Design Review Working Sessions. The differences in the two options were purely color-related as the building design is set. The two color options for the exterior provided a very different look, image and

feel for the building. RDA presented a “brick like” red option for the metal panels and a “limestone like” cream option. An Exterior Design Study Narrative was provided that outlined the design theory behind each option including pros and cons. When asked to narrow the options to one, there was a near split decision and the Committee decided to get more input from the Mayor and the Committee members that were not present at the meeting. For the 60% CD Submission to the MSBA, RDA will present the cream-colored elevations and renderings as this option had the edge in the preliminary voting. Depending on the final vote, the final color option can be presented to the MSBA in the 90% CD Submission.

Miscellaneous Design Modifications

2. There was discussion about changing from an EPDM roof to a PVC roof if the budget would allow the increase of about \$131k because of the LEED point available for white roofs and the fact that white roofs are less attractive to seagulls. A decision is needed by the next SBC Meeting.
3. JLA is waiting on a response from MSBA as to whether the building has to pay to receive LEED certification or if the process can be followed without LEED providing the final certification.

II. Peer Reviews

Overview of Final Structural and Geotechnical Peer Reviews Received

4. The Design Team responded to the initial peer review comments on the 75% structural plans and specifications and incorporated as appropriate into the Early Bid Package No. 1 bid addenda. The Peer Reviewers reviewed the responses and the 100% structural plans and specifications and made final comments. The comments were incorporated as appropriate in the bid addendum that was issued during the “best & final” Subcontractor bid phase. The OPM informed the SBC that the comments and responses will be included in the 60% CD Submission.

III. Review of the 60% Construction Documents Construction Cost Estimates

Cost Comparison/Reconciliation Spreadsheet

5. JLA handed out the cost comparison/reconciliation spreadsheet. The Design Team and the Walsh and PM&C estimators met on 5/5/14 to reconcile the estimates. Prior to reconciliation, the estimates were approximately \$650K apart. At the end of reconciliation, the estimates were only \$152K apart which is less than ¼% variance. Both estimates were below budget at the end of reconciliation.

Value Engineering Items

6. A concrete related value engineering item was taken during the estimating process and was reflected in a bid addendum. Concrete re-bar couplers were eliminated. Another value engineering opportunity, the HVAC rooftop acoustical screens, was discussed and will be further evaluated if needed to maintain budget in the 90% CD phase. The screens are desired if the budget will allow; however, there may be opportunity to eliminate a portion of the screens along the rear of the building.
7. STC 48 is being utilized for the Windows/Storefronts/Curtainwalls to maintain budget. A change in the STC rating could swing the bids significantly. The Design Team is working to keep the costs of this trade within budget.

IV. Interim Guaranteed Maximum Price No. 1

IGMP 1 Cost Comparison to Control Budget Spreadsheet

8. Joslin Lesser handed out the IGMP 1 Cost to Control Budget Comparison spreadsheet. While there were some bids over budget and some under budget, the overall cost of IGMP1 was within budget when a less than pro rata share of the Design & Pricing Contingency and Escalation was proportioned to IGMP 1. The trade with the most significant overage was concrete. While Walsh was finally able to get four bidders,

the low bid was still just under ~\$700 over budget. The spreadsheet indicated the Control Budget, IGMP 1 costs and project costs for the remaining work based on the 60% cost estimates.

9. Two other trades were of concern as having the potential to run over budget given the current market. These trades were Gypsum Board Wall Assemblies and Window/Storefront/Curtainwall. The Project Team is looking at strategies to mitigate overages in these trades.
10. No operable windows because of the STC rating required and because the building is fully air-conditioned.

Approval Status

11. The IGMP 1 has been reviewed by the City and is in the process of being executed.

V. Testing and Inspections Proposals

Proposal Cost Comparison Analysis Spreadsheet

12. JLA handed out a Cost Comparison Analysis spreadsheet comparing the unit rates received from the four testing and inspections companies that responded to the Request for Proposals. The four companies were: Briggs, Terracon, PSI and John Turner Consulting. The SBC reviewed the spreadsheet
13. The SBC discussed the qualifications of each company and then agreed to commit the proposed amount of \$39,480 and to select Briggs Engineering & Testing.

The following vote was taken:

Motion: Motion made and moved by Ed Calnan that the Thurgood Marshall Middle School Building Committee vote to commit a budget of \$39,480 and vote to award the Testing and Inspection Services to Briggs Engineering & Testing. Seconded by Richard Fortucci.

Vote: 5 in favor, 0 against. The vote was unanimous and there was no discussion.

VI. Overview of 60% Construction Documents Submission

14. The 60% Construction Documents Submission was reviewed and approved for submission.

The following vote was taken:

Motion: Motion made and moved by Dr. Latham that the Thurgood Marshall Middle School Building Committee vote to approve the 60% Construction Documents Submission for submittal to the MSBA. Seconded by Mike Donovan.

Vote: 5 in favor, 0 against. The vote was unanimous and there was no discussion.

VII. Construction Schedule Update

Overall Construction Schedule Update

15. Walsh handed out an updated Construction Schedule and reviewed.

The Construction Schedule is targeting the following dates:

- Demolition/Foundations Permit filed – May 6, 2014
- Mobilization on site – May 12, 2014
- Start Steel Fabrication – May 12, 2014 target; trying to shave 20 days off steel duration from 100 days to 80 days starting May 12th
- Site Prep Work – May 12th start; Fence site; erosion control measures, strip site
- Pre-Pile Survey/Pre-excavation – June start

- Piles – July start; 30 days
- Concrete – August start
- Steel – October – December 2014

16. In removing the hydraulic fluid and water from the service pits in the commercial garage building on site, Sovereign found that one pit was leaking clean groundwater after steam cleaning and one pit was leaking groundwater with some product in it. The pits will be removed and the impacted groundwater and soils will be removed. A conference call will be held with Sovereign to discuss the most cost effective way to accomplish the clean-up.

VIII. Other Business

Construction Site Webcam

17. Joslin Lesser presented some product information on webcams and asked the SBC if they were interested in having a webcam for the project. After some discussion, the SBC decided that they did not wish to spend the money for a webcam.

IX. Meeting Schedule

18. The following meetings have been scheduled:

- TMMS Building Committee Meeting June 3, 2014 Room 206 10:00 AM

Future Working Group Meetings will be scheduled at the conclusion of each meeting on an as needed basis.

X. Adjourn

Vote to Adjourn

19. The following vote was taken:

Motion: Motion made and moved by Dr. Latham that the Thurgood Marshall Middle School Building Committee vote to adjourn the meeting at 12:36 PM. Seconded by Richard Fortucci.

Vote: 5 in favor, 0 against. The vote was unanimous and there was no discussion.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn Stapleton

Joslin, Lesser + Associates, Inc.